



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/810,827

03/29/2004

Tadashi Hayashi

00862.018055

1010

5514 7590 09/05/2007  
FITZPATRICK CELLA HARPER & SCINTO  
30 ROCKEFELLER PLAZA  
NEW YORK, NY 10112

EXAMINER

TYSON, MELANIE RUANO

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3731

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

09/05/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/810,827

Applicant(s)

HAYASHI ET AL.

Examiner

Melanie Tyson

Art Unit

3731

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 3-15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 2 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 29 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☒ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/29/04.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to Applicant's election received on 08 June 2007.

#### ***Election/Restrictions***

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Group I with Species A in the reply filed on 08 June 2007 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that filing another application of the same disclosure and being subjected to the same search would result in a burden on the Patent and Trademark Office. This is not found persuasive.

The criteria for a proper requirement for restriction are as follows: (1) the inventions must be independent or distinct, and (2) there would be a serious burden if restriction were not required. Groups I and II are distinct in that the process as claimed can be used to make a materially different product (see restriction requirement for details). Furthermore, the inventions have acquired a separate status in the art in view of their different classification (see restriction requirement for details), thus requiring a different search. Therefore, there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction were not required.

The species are distinct in that they do not overlap in scope (species A requires a hydrophilic and hydrophobic surface, species B requires a heater, species C requires a temperature-responsive polymer coating, and species D requires a control circuit). Furthermore, since the identified species do not overlap in scope, different search queries would be performed resulting in a different search. Therefore, there would be a serious burden on the examiner if restriction were not required.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made **FINAL**.

2. Claims 3-15 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention and species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 08 June 2007.

***Priority***

3. Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Should applicant desire to obtain the benefit of foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d) prior to declaration of an interference, a certified English translation of the foreign application must be submitted in reply to this action. 37 CFR 41.154(b) and 41.202(e).

Failure to provide a certified translation may result in no benefit being accorded for the non-English application.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 2 recites the limitation "wherein the hydrophobic surface and the hydrophilic surface are respectively coated with a hydrophobic film and a hydrophilic film." It is unclear as to whether the surfaces are hydrophobic and hydrophilic after coating, or if the surfaces are hydrophobic and hydrophilic prior to

Art Unit: 3731

coating, and then an additional hydrophilic and hydrophobic coating is applied to the respective surfaces.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Disharoon (4,317,401). Disharoon discloses a vibrating knife (see entire document) comprising an excision portion (30) that excises a target, wherein a surface located on the forward side is hydrophobic and a surface on a backward side is hydrophilic (for example, see column 7, lines 31-38).

7. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Disharoon.

Claim 2 is being treated as a product by process limitation, in that “the hydrophobic surface and the hydrophilic surface are coated” refers to the process of forming the surfaces and not to the final product created. As set forth in MPEP 2113, “Even though product-by-process claims are limited by and defined by the process, determination of patentability is based on the product itself. The patentability of a product does not depend on its method of production. If the product in the product-by-process claim is the same as or obvious from a product in the prior art, the claim is unpatentable even though the prior product was made by a different process.” In re

Art Unit: 3731

Thorpe, 777 F.2d 695,698,227 USPQ 964,966 (Fed. Cir. 1985). Examiner has evaluated the product claim without giving much weight to the method of its manufacture. Therefore, in this case, the surfaces described above wherein the surfaces are formed by coating is directed to the method of making the surfaces and not to the final product made. It appears that the product disclosed by Disharoon would be the same ~~as claimed~~ as that claimed; especially since both applicant's product and the prior art product have the same final structure of a vibrating knife having a surface located on the forward side that is hydrophobic and a surface on a backward side is hydrophilic.

However, in the alternative, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide hydrophilic and hydrophobic surfaces by coating the excision portion, since it is well known to coat surgical devices with a particular coating in an application that requires such a surface. Furthermore, it has been held that constructing a formerly integral structure into various elements involves only routine skill in the art.


### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Melanie Tyson whose telephone number is (571) 272-9062. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8:30-7.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jackie Ho can be reached on (571) 272-4696. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3731

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Melanie Tyson   
August 28, 2007

  
(JACKIE) TAN-UYEN HO  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER